

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER**MAY 03 2006**REMARKS/ARGUMENT

1. The claim 4 has been amended to cite that the bearing 214 has the top thereof being flush with the joint between the middle bore section of the sleeve 211 and the upper bore section of the sleeve 211 and the outer diameter of the bearing is less than the inner diameter of middle bore section such that an annular oil storage part 216 is formed for receiving lubrication oil.

2. Discussion of claim rejection under the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. § 112:

The amended claim 4 has been cited without the phrase "fixedly attached" to comply with first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. § 112 and the rejection is traversed.

3. Discussion of claim rejection under 35 U.S.C. §113(a):

(a) The bearing 30 of Hsieh, as shown in Fig. 2 of the disclosure, provides a plurality of grooves 34 at the periphery thereof with an arcuate notch 341 at the top and lower edge of the respective grooves 34 and has a truncate top portion 33. The bearing 30 is disposed in the cylinder sleeve 21 to fit with the inner wall of the sleeve 21 in a way of the outer surface of the bearing 30 contacting with the inner wall of the sleeve 21 as shown in Fig. 4. Further, a receiving room 38 is formed under the bearing 30 to communicate with the grooves 34.

(b) Contrast to Hsieh, the application arranges three sections with different inner diameters and the annular oil storage part 216 of the application is formed to surround the bearing 214 and no grooves are provided as the bearing 30

of Hsieh does. Further, no receiving room is provided under the bearing 214 and no cap is disposed at the top of the bearing 214 in the application but Hsieh does.

(c) As for Shy, the structure of the application is different from Shy and differences between the application and Shy have been compared in detail in the previous response. Further, Shy does not provide the annular oil storage part 216 as well for receiving lubrication oil.

4. In view of the above argument, the characteristics cited in the currently amended claim 4 are not disclosed by either Hsieh or Shy and the differences of the claim 4 from Hsieh and Shy are not obvious the application. It is request the currently amended claim 4 be reconsidered and rejection based on 35 U.S.C. § 112; first pasragraph be withdrawn. Such action is respectfully solicited.

Respectfully submitted

Mao-Lin CHEN

MAO-LIN CHEN

Dated: May 3, 2006